

### **Remarks/Arguments**

This Response is considered fully responsive to the Office Action mailed March 12, 2007. Claims 1- 24 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 4, 7, 9, 12, 15, 17, 20 and 23 stand rejected. Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22 and 24 stand objected to but have been deemed allowable if rewritten in independent form to incorporate the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. A section of the specification has been amended. Claims 1 and 9-17 have been amended herein. No claims have been canceled. No new claims have been added. Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

### **Specification**

The Office has objected to the specification because of certain informalities. The Applicant has amended the paragraph on page 5, lines 10-18, to overcome the objections. The amendments are expected to also address the Office's objections to the Drawings. The Applicant believes that no new matter is added by the amendments and therefore requests that the Office enter the enclosed amendment to the specification.

### **Drawings**

The Office has objected to the drawings because (1) reference characters "132" and "134" have purportedly both been used to designate a printed circuit board; (2) reference character "134" has purportedly been used to designate both a printed circuit board and a flex bracket; and (3) the drawings purportedly fail to show a flex bracket as described in the specification. The Applicant has amended the specification in a manner that (1) replaces a reference character "132" in the specification with a reference number "134" in association with the printed circuit board; (2) adds a reference number "130" in association with the description of a "flex assembly" (which is consistent with the Figures); and (3) deletes a reference character "134" in association with a "flex bracket". The Applicant respectfully submits that no changes to the drawings are required to overcome these objections to the drawings. Withdrawal of the objections to the drawings is respectfully requested.

### **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1, 4, 7, 9, 12, 15, 17, 20 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being purportedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,054,249 to Okada (hereafter "Okada"). Applicant

respectfully traverses this rejection. Nevertheless, the Applicant has amended the claims to clarify the recited invention.

Claims 1, 9, and 17 have been amended to clarify that each logical zone of the plurality of logical zones extend radially from a common inner diameter to a common outer diameter of the storage medium. In contrast, the “zones” disclosed in Okada are concentric zones about the center of the circular storage medium. None of the zones in Okada extend radially from a common inner diameter to a common outer diameter of the storage medium. Furthermore, claims 1, 9 and 17 recite writing of data into a first logical zone. However, Okada fails to disclose or teach writing data to any logical zone (i.e., any logical zone as specifically recited in claims 1, 9, and 17). Accordingly, Okada fails to disclose or suggest the plurality of logical zones or the writing of data to such a logical zone as recited in claims 1, 9, and 17.

Furthermore, claims 1 and 9 have been amended to clarify that data from a first stream of data is written within determined bounds of a first logical zone, wherein the bounds of the first logical zone are determined by an amount of time for rotating through the first logical zone based on a rotational speed of the storage medium and a size of the first logical zone. Also, claim 17 recites writing data from a first stream of data to a first logical zone of the plurality of logical zones for up to an amount of time corresponding to a rotational speed of the storage medium and a size of the first logical zone.

The Office has pointed to text in cols. 21 and 22 of Okada as disclosing the originally recited features. However, Okada discloses specifically in cols. 21 and 22 a set of concentric circular zones, each zone having an increasing storage capacity and transfer rate as the zones diameter increases from the center of the storage medium. In consideration of these varying transfer rates, Okada teaches that the zone into which data is written is selected based on the number of channels writing the data – the more channels, the higher the transfer-rate required and the farther out on the diameter of the storage medium the data is written. Therefore, while Okada discloses zones having characteristic capacities and transfer rates, Okada fails to disclose or suggest writing data within determined bounds of a first logical zone, wherein the bounds are determined based on the rotational speed of the storage medium and the size of the first logical zone, as recited in claims 1 and 9. Likewise, Okada fails to disclose writing data from a first stream of data to a first logical zone of the plurality of logical zones for up to an amount of time corresponding to a rotational speed of the storage medium and a size of the first logical zone.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Okada fails to anticipate or make obvious the invention of claims 1, 9, and 17, and allowance of claims 1, 9 and 17 is respectfully requested.

Claims 4 and 7 depend from claim 1. Claims 12 and 15 depend from claim 9. Claims 20 and 23 depend from claim 17. The base claims for each of claims 4, 7, 12, 15, 20 and 23 are believed to be allowable. Therefore, each of claims 4, 7, 12, 15, 20 and 23 are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims. Therefore, allowance of claims 4, 7, 12, 15, 20 and 23 is respectfully requested.

**Allowable Subject Matter**

Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22 and 24 stand objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In light of the arguments and amendments made herein, the Applicant believes that claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22 and 24 are allowable in their current form. Thus, Applicant respectfully request that claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22 and 24 be allowed.

### **Conclusion**

Applicant have fully responded to each and every objection and rejection in the Office action dated March 12, 2007 and believe that claims 1-24 are in a condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicant respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Applicant believes no other fees or petitions are due with this filing. However, should any such fees or petitions be required, please consider this a request therefor and authorization to charge Deposit Account No. 50-3199 as necessary.

If the Office believes any issues could be resolved via a telephone interview, the Office is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Date: 12 June 2007

Respectfully submitted,

/Richard J. Holzer, Jr./  
Richard J. Holzer, Jr., Reg. No. 42,668  
Attorney for Applicant  
USPTO Customer No. 64776

HENSLEY KIM & EDGINGTON, LLC  
1660 Lincoln Street, Suite 3050  
Denver, Colorado 80264  
Tel: 720-377-0770  
Fax: 720-377-0777